

**TAHOE COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE - PLANNING COMMISSION – October 30, 2013 –  
PUBLIC INPUT**

**\*\*PLEASE BE AWARE THESE HEARINGS ARE RECORDED AND AN AUDIO IS AVAILABLE FOR VERBATIM DISCUSSION\*\***

**Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista resident and North Tahoe Community Plan West Team:**

Have attended other team meetings to watch process of other teams. Staff stated stories vs. height are still confusing as written on Page 15 of the Staff Report. Two-stories need to be more definitive outside of the town centers. Would like to see the Maris Valley West Parcel placed on the Commission's agenda. Commercial Neighborhood Core is different than Town Center Cores and should be looked at differently. There is a huge difference in density and scale and how the community is going to come together on this. Looking forward to receiving the documents in the Spring.

**Ann Nicholes – realtor for 42 years on North Tahoe Community Plan East Team:** Concerned we have too much commercial already. And by expanding the boundaries to include 64-acres and river, if she were a developer she would go to those new areas instead of revitalizing the old area. Not sure they will achieve their goal to fix up town center first. How much can we support with the weird population swing? What is the existing inventory? Received a marketing analysis which wasn't helpful. Need large scale development not small development. Need cool low impact boutique. Talk to tax locals for infrastructure but there are not enough of them. Worried about expansion idea and the need to keep open space. If beneficial to local and tourist that would be great. Need an analysis of what we have and what we can support. What is mixed-use recreation?

**Shannon Eckmyer – League to Save Lake Tahoe:** Echo Ann's concerns. Thank TRPA and Planning staff for keeping open lines of communications through Planning stages of the process. While there are no formal proposals for the expansion of town centers, the Tahoe City visioning and the presentation shown today showed expansion of the Tahoe City town center boundary to include the golf course and 64 acres of forest land. These boundaries were created thru the Regional Plan update through TRPA and are intended as receiving sites for redevelopment. The golf course, as Crystal stated, is primarily sensitive land and the 64-acre forest land areas are not appropriate for the type of development that the town centers were created for. They believe in talking with TRPA and Placer County staff that there are other ways to incorporate these areas to accomplish the Tahoe City visioning and include these areas as gateways. The community is intending to, for example, to rename these or creating the town center overlays for Placer County so that it is not conflicting with the Bi-state agreement and the intentions of TRPA. The League welcomes any opportunity to continue working with Placer County and TRPA to resolve this issue.

**Shay Navaro – TRPA:** TRPA has staff assigned to work on process and coordinate with teams. TRPA staff has attended each meeting and is working closely with Placer County staff on the draft document. Looking forward to receiving the draft policy document in the new year and looking forward to reviewing it for code compliance and conformance with TRPA requirements. Spoke of height conflicts that were out of alignment with TRPA codes. Could be confusion referencing stories - so far proposals are within their allowable limits. Also the town center boundaries they are in support of club house site and the lower area that backs along the developed area of the golf course. Needs more analysis to show what the benefits would be if increased boundaries. Changing boundaries is an arduous process. Still in discussion with no formal proposal. Offered Chapter 13 document for the Commissioners if they would like to review.

**Gary Davis – part of the Tahoe City Visioning process and part of the West Area Plan Team:** With consensus of team members, they accepted the principles of the Visioning Plan that was done in 2012 for Tahoe City. Intent of Plan Area Team is to continue to work within the confines of the RPU that was approved in December and all other normal constraints on height, land coverage and parking requirements. Want the opportunity to have the golf course and 64-acres part of the Plan area because they are looking at the 20 – 30 year window of the Plan. Height limits should be redefined, maybe suggest two-stories and go with a number it is easier for developers. Owner of the Golf Course opted out of Plan in past by choice and 64-acre was trailer park long time that was within the land owners opportunity to do with it what they want in recreational area and will probably keep it recreation. A large percentage of the golf course will stay Open Space and SEZ. It will still not be developable. There are valuable part to the golf course that are contiguous to the Commercial Core to provide opportunity to bring some parcels together and provide something significant rather than these small historic parcels that you can't get parking on and without getting height increases can't get any redevelopment that makes sense for the community. Need redevelopment for the tired old buildings that have been there for 50, 60, 80 years that don't provide any economic vitality for the town.

**Alex Mourelatos, one owner of Lake Shore Resort, Tahoe Vista, Tahoe North Team participant (Tahoe Vista and Carnelian Bay):**

Own lake front parcels and forest side parcels. On the forest side, the parcels are both in and out of the current Community Plan. Applauds staff for work done to date being a lay person the terminology and concepts reviewed can be confusing but feel we have achieved consensus on important issues. Applaud application of mixed use even though there may be concerns on how it is applied. It is a concept that will make a significant change in the way the residential and commercial cores are developed. The flexibility of mixed use and its design will help to make projects economically viable where in the past it would be more restrictive. Tiering of story on the forest side needs to be revisited. 1995-2001 remodel example of how to open up and shift to create tiers to view the lake and road side. Debated tiering down in Tahoe Vista at the Holiday House and the marina. Value of the benefit to tier down was discussed and debated but still need to refine and discuss.

**Steve Tesnara, Sustainable Communities Advocates:** Their company helps sustain communities. Commented on the complexity of the specific area Plans. Spoke of adding the golf course to Area Plan and how long the process would be but don't be intimidated by the time it takes to complete process, of course the golf course is part of Tahoe City. It would be a missed opportunity if we didn't involve it in this Plan. Spoke of SEZ restoration. Should be incentives to those who restore SEZ. Feels there should be more mention of the State Route 89 project alignment in the Plan. Also feels you should involve the TAC (Technical Advisory Committee) in more meetings not just at Plan document review. Would like to see more feedback on comments whether one on one or at meetings before draft comes out. Comment on Crystal's timeline - TRPA has three steps to the timeline presented: 1) Regional Plan implementation process, once endorsed then goes to 2) Advisory Planning Commission, then to 3) Governing Board for final. Thanks to all your efforts.

**Written comments were provided in the staff report of October 30, 2013 Attachment J:**

**E-mails were submitted prior to hearing and not in October 30, 2013 packet:**

Gregg Gatto

Jim Williamson

Shannon Eckmeyer